



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/865,136

05/24/2001

Indra Laksono

VIXS 005

8018

34399 7590 12/15/2008  
GARLICK HARRISON & MARKISON  
P.O. BOX 160727  
AUSTIN, TX 78716-0727

EXAMINER

VAN HANDEL, MICHAEL P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2424

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/15/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/865,136	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LAKSONO, INDRA	
	<b>Examiner</b> MICHAEL VAN HANDEL	<b>Art Unit</b> 2424	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael Van Handel. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Kevin Smith. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 09 December 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic    b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant    2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes    e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Rakib et al. (US 2004/0172658).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached.    g) ☐ was not reached.    h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed differences between the invention's mixing and the examiner's interpretation of mixing as taught by Rakib et al. Applicant further discussed the filed amendments. The examiner noted that the amendments did not appear to overcome Rakib et al. The examiner indicated that amending the claims to use frequency division multiplexing would most likely overcome Rakib et al.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Chris Kelley/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2424